MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Educational Technology and Data Coordination

GRANT ANNOUNCEMENT

SUBJECT: **2008-2009 Title II, Part D Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant Program, Category VI: Models of Demonstrated Proficiency**

The URL for this grant application:
http://megs.mde.state.mi.us/megs/login.asp

Included at this site: **Grant Announcement Information and Application, including Form OG-4929 Guidance on the 2008-2009 Title II, Part D Enhancing Education Through Technology Program, U.S. Department of Education**

NATURE OF ACTION REQUESTED _____X_____Voluntary

The Michigan Department of Education is pleased to announce a 2008-2009 Title II, Part D Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant. Approximately $1,100,000 will be made available for this grant in the 2008-2009 grant cycle. This is a competitive grant program.

DISCLAIMER:
    THE FOLLOWING GRANT IS ANNOUNCED AND AWARD IS CONTINGENT ON THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

Category VI: Models of Demonstrated Proficiency

INTRODUCTION:

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is offering a grant to support the exploration and implementation of innovative models of student-centered (focused on the student's needs, abilities, interests, and learning styles with the teacher as a facilitator of learninghttp://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Student) instructional design that lead to student success in environments that are not dependent on physical facilities and time. These models must be research based and incorporate both concepts of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and the effective use of technology. Funding for this program has been awarded to MDE by the U.S. Department of Education under Title II, Part D of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, **CFDA Number 84.318**, Enhancing Education Through Technology.

This competitive grant category will be known as the 2008-2009 Models of Demonstrated Proficiency Grant.

The grant applications will be submitted through the Michigan Electronic Grant System (MEGS): http://megs.mde.state.mi.us/megs/login.asp. All applicants must be authorized to use the grant system by their institution's Level 5 authorized official assigned to MEGS. A separate application must be submitted for each project proposed. To initiate the application, log into MEGS and initiate the "Educational Technology – Competitive (FY 2008)" application. Under the General Information section, click on "Grant Categories" and select the category for which you are applying.

Questions regarding the 2008-2009 Title II, Part D Enhancing Education Through Technology Grants may be directed to Barbara Fardell in MDE's Office of Educational Technology and Data Coordination, (517) 241-3629.

PURPOSE OF THE GRANT:

The goal is to focus resources on implementation of innovative, student-centered instructional delivery that will award secondary (high school) credit based on demonstrated proficiencies in the Michigan High School Content Expectations (HSCEs). This delivery must incorporate the effective use of technology and UDL principles. The models proposed should focus on change of instruction based upon student demonstration of knowledge gained. It is expected that these student-centered approaches will result in a decrease in the district's dropout rate over the two year period of the grant and an increase in student performance against state standards. Proposed programs should stress a focus on one or more of the following within the high needs / at-risk student population stipulated by Title IID competitive grant guidelines, as defined in the following section:

- Dropout prevention
- Retention of students
- Increased graduation / credit recovery / credit completion rates
- Credit completion independent from time spent on task

Preference will be given to proposals that have significant scope and scale in terms of students served, comprehensive program design, and significant potential for sustainability and replication. Partnerships may consist of intermediate school districts (ISDs), LEAs, and PSAs.

Proposals that include technology based curriculum, assessment, and/or instructional models must be aligned to the Michigan Content Expectations. Preference will be given to those that include application of those expectations in real world, relevant job related scenarios, and/or project based/problem solving instruction. A website will be available with curriculum options for this grant including course demos.

Preference will be given to proposals that include a Michigan certified teacher in the delivery of instruction. If a technology enabled curriculum is selected to deliver instruction it must facilitate teacher/student interaction, peer to peer interaction, and allow course authoring to modify or change to meet district and student needs.

Any consortium application must include at least one LEA that meets the target population requirement.

Proposals may require a seat time waiver for implementation; however, a seat time waiver is not required for a successful proposal. The seat time waiver and Models of Demonstrated Proficiency grant award processes are independent of each other; therefore, awarding of

this grant does not necessitate nor guarantee the award of a seat time waiver. For guidance on applying for a waiver please contact MaryAlice Galloway at GallowayM@michigan.gov.

TARGET POPULATION TO BE SERVED BY THE GRANT

This grant is targeted to "high need local educational agencies (LEAs)". A high need LEA is one that -

(1)   Is among those LEAs in Michigan with the highest numbers or percentages of children from families with incomes below the poverty line as defined by the TITLE I - PART A, ALLOCATIONS School Year 2006-07.

and

(2)   Serves one or more schools identified for improvement or corrective action under Title I, Part A, section 1116 of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001.

GRANT RANGE:

It is anticipated that ten grants will be awarded in the amount of approximately $110,000 each. Please note that the department reserves the right to award smaller grants based on the preferences listed above. **Total Funds Available: $1,100,000**

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS:

The following are eligible: Local educational agencies (LEAs) or eligible local partnerships, which can include Intermediate School Districts (ISDs). Eligible LEAs and partnerships must include one or more districts with at least one school that has been identified for improvement or corrective action, because it has not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for one or more years, and that fit within the earlier stated guidelines on family income below the poverty line. As it pertains to ISDs, other school districts within the eligible ISD are permitted to participate. Nonpublic schools residing within a qualifying LEA are also eligible to participate.

ASSURANCE OF ACCURACY:

For each application an assurance must be submitted stating that all information provided within is true and accurate. If during the implementation of any funded project MDE establishes that inaccurate or false information was provided in the application, the grant may be rescinded.

CLOSING DATE AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS:

Eligible LEAS or consortia must submit a grant application using the Michigan Electronic Grants System no later than **11:59 p.m., November 21, 2008** to the Michigan Department of Education. The application will include a narrative, abstract, and budget. The applications will be submitted within MEGS.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

As previously stated, the funded entity will devote a minimum of 25% of the grant funds to professional development as required by the EETT Federal Guidelines.

CENTRAL GRANT COORDINATION AND EVALUATION

Grant recipients will be required to set aside 15% of the overall award to fund grant program coordination activities, principally the forming and support of a professional learning community among the recipient LEAs to facilitate the exchange of ideas and lessons learned and to ensure their transference to the greater education community. This required set aside will also fund a central evaluation of recipient programs.

NONPUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

The Enhancing Education through Technology (Ed Tech) program statute requires applicants to provide meaningful opportunity for the equitable participation of teachers and administrators from nonpublic schools in professional learning and equipment funded under Ed Tech. This opportunity **must occur during the planning stages** of the application so that the proposed initiative and the funding request take into consideration the needs of the nonpublic staff. Grant applicants are required to document the planning activities that occur between public and nonpublic entities and to maintain as documentation items such as copies of letters inviting nonpublic participation. Funds may not be used for nonpublic substitute teacher costs.

Narrative. The grant narrative should be written in the sequence of the rubric. All pages in attachments should have one inch margins and be collated and numbered consecutively throughout. The narrative is limited to fifteen double-spaced pages. The font size should be no smaller than eleven point. Appendices can be used to provide supplementary material. Appendices will be limited to a total of five pages.

Abstract. This is a one page description of the project. The abstract is not used in the scoring of the grant proposal.

Budget. Each application will include a budget. The budget will be reviewed to ensure that it is adequate to support the project. There should be clear evidence of a relationship between budget items and project objectives. All budget items must be identified to show which partner directly benefits. Twenty-five percent (25%) of the grant funds must be used for professional learning related to the project. Fifteen percent (15%) must be reserved to fund central coordination and evaluation activities. The budget must include a budget summary and budget detail following the Michigan School Accounting Manual.

Final Report. The awardees must provide a report of the project to include measurable outcomes based on grant objectives. The grantee will be required to compile data to provide a means to evaluate the effectiveness of the grant.

PROCESS FOR THE GRANT COMPETITION:

ISDs or eligible LEAs will compete for the 2008-2009 Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tech) Program grants through established procedures utilized by MDE in managing its grant programs. Applications will be received and reviewed. Grants will be awarded based on the highest scores as identified in the rubric and possibly geographic representation.

The tentative time frame for the operation of this grant program includes these major milestones:

November 21, 2008	Application deadline date
December 3, 2008	Funding recommendations presented to the Superintendent of Public Instruction; awards issued
Summer 2009	Annual Progress Reviews (conducted by MDE staff)
September 30, 2010	Projects to be completed
October 31, 2010	Final Performance Report due
November 30, 2010	Final Expenditure Report due

VARYING AWARD AMOUNTS

The Department of Education anticipates awarding ten $110,000 Models of Demonstrated Proficiency awards; however, the Department reserves the right to award less or more based on project size, scope, and perceived benefits to Michigan's education community.

REJECTION OF PROPOSALS:

The Department of Education reserves the right to reject any and all proposals received as a result of this announcement.

REVIEW PROCESS:

MDE utilizes an expert review panel when scoring its competitive grants. For this grant program, review teams will be composed of people both within MDE and outside MDE as needed, with expertise in curriculum and technology. MDE staff will supervise the review.

Award selections will be based on merit and quality as determined by points awarded for the Review Criteria Section and all relevant information. The following rubrics will be used as a rating instrument in the review process. All funding will be subject to the approval by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. All applicants will be notified of the Superintendent's action.

In addition to the content of the rubric categories below, the Superintendent of Public Instruction may apply other factors in making funding decisions, such as (1) geographic distribution; (2) duplication of effort; (3) duplication of funding; and/or (4) performance of the fiscal agent on previously funded initiatives.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

The Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant Program is intended to improve student achievement through the use of technology. Ed Tech is also intended to combine high quality professional learning to teachers and administrators with technology tools to further enhance learning opportunities for all children. The scoring rubric below should be used as a guide when writing the proposal. The reviewers will judge proposals against the elements described in the rubrics. The proposals most likely to be funded are those that have most completely addressed all the elements described in the "Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous" column of the rubrics. A narrative that is written in the sequence of the rubrics facilitates evaluation by the grant readers.

TIE BREAKER:

The Ed Tech grant program targets buildings and districts most in need of additional resources for professional learning and technology resources to improve student achievement. In the event of a tie score, the applicant with the lowest census poverty level will prevail.

FINAL REPORT:

The awardees must provide a report of the project to include measurable outcomes based on grant objectives. The grantee will be required to compile data to provide a means to evaluate the effectiveness of the grant. In addition, a template will be provided for the web based report that will be posted on the MDE/Edtech website.

EETT Models of Demonstrated Proficiency Grant Category VI

GRANT RUBRIC

A. Description of Need – 15 pts.

- Describe population of students to be served.
- Cite sources of data used to identify needs, including the District or School Improvement Plan.
- Describe the gaps in existing resources and how this project will address those gaps.
- Describe the process that was used to create "buy-in" from School Board, teachers and families for this project.

Rating Scale

Minimal 1-5 pts.	Adequate 6-10 pts.	Excellent 11-15 pts.
• Population is poorly identified. • Few sources of data were cited. • Gaps in existing resources were poorly addressed. • Little or no "buy-in" effort from local board, families, and teachers indicated.	• Population to be served has been identified. • Data was identified that supports need for grant. • There is a limited reference to gaps in existing resources. • It is stated that the School Board, teachers, and families are aware of this project but there is little documentation.	• The proposal explains the identification process for the students that will be served by the grant. • Relevant data is provided that clearly supports the need for the proposal. • There is a clear description of gaps in existing resources and an explanation as to how this proposal will address those gaps. • School Board, teachers, and families are aware of this proposal and support is documented.

Score_____/15

EETT Models of Demonstrated Proficiency Grant Category VI

B. Scope and Scale – 15 pts.

- Describe the number of students served with this proposal.
- Describe how the proposal has significant potential for sustainability and replication.
- Describe how the project will address at least three or more core content areas.

Rating Scale

Minimal 1-5 pts.	Adequate 6-10 pts.	Excellent 11-15 pts.
• Proposal does not describe how many students will be served. • There is no description how project will be sustained. • There is no description how proposal can be replicated (scaled) in other districts. • Proposal does not reference how many or what content areas will be addressed in the project.	• Proposal identifies a target student population and serves a limited number of students. • There is a limited description of how proposal can be sustained. • There is a limited description how proposal can be scaled in other districts. • Proposal covers more than one content area.	• Proposal identifies a target student population and serves a large number of students. • The proposal provides a detailed description how proposal will be sustained without additional grant funding. • The proposal provides a detailed description as to how the project can be scaled in other Michigan districts. • The proposal addresses three or more high school expectations content areas (scope) or incorporates Career and Technical Education (CTE) elements into its design.

Score_____/15

C. Change of Instructional Design – 20 pts.

- Identify research base for proposed models of instructional design.
- Describe how the change of instructional design is innovative.
- Describe how the proposed instructional model is student centered and allows students to achieve competency at their individual pace of learning.
- Describe how instruction is not dependent on physical facilities and time.

Rating Scale

Minimal 1-5 pts.	Adequate 6-15 pts.	Excellent 16-20 pts.
• Instructional design is not research based. • Instructional design shows little innovation. • Instructional design shows little evidence of being student centered or student focused. • There is little evidence that instruction is not dependent on physical facilities and time.	• Instructional design is research based. • Some innovation is evident in instructional design. • There is some evidence of instruction being student centered and some is self-paced. • Students can do some of their work independent of physical facilities and time.	• Supporting research is cited that shows success with this method of instruction. • The proposal shows innovation in both delivery and instructional design. • The entire focus of instruction is student centered and self-paced. • The majority of the learning takes place independent of physical facilities and time.

Score_____/20

EETT Models of Demonstrated Proficiency Grant Category VI

D. Proposal must include UDL and engage ALL learners – 15

- Identify how Universal Design is incorporated into as much of the content delivered as possible.

- Describe how proposal will engage all students, including those at-risk of not graduating.

Rating Scale

Minimal 1-5 pts.	Adequate 6-10 pts.	Excellent 11-15 pts.
- There is little or no evidence of UDL in the content to be delivered to students. - There is little or no audio in digital curriculum described. - There are no closed captions in videos in chosen digital curriculum. - There is little or no description of how students will be more engaged in learning under this proposal.	- There is some evidence of UDL. - Some of the content is read aloud to the students. - Some videos are closed captioned. - There is some evidence that proposal intends to provide more engaging instruction and content.	- Students always have multiple ways of accessing curriculum, assessment, and instruction. - Videos are closed captioned and almost all of the content is read aloud. - It is very evident that the proposal intends to provide instruction and content that will engage ALL students.

Score_____/15

EETT Models of Demonstrated Proficiency Grant Category VI

E. Methods of Demonstrating Proficiency must be identified in the grant – 20 pts.

- Identify the instructional model used that facilitates the awarding of secondary credit based on demonstrated proficiency.

- Describe how the proposal includes technology based curriculum and instruction.

- Describe how the proposal ensures that curriculum aligns to Michigan Content Expectations.

- Describe how curriculum and instruction facilitates practice and application of the Michigan Content Expectations in real world, relevant job-related scenarios and/or project based/problem solving application.

Rating Scale

Minimal 1-6 pts.	Adequate 7-12 pts.	Excellent 13-20 pts.
- There is little or no description of how demonstrated proficiency is achieved. - There is no description of any technology based curriculum. - Grant does not show how curriculum aligns to Michigan Content Expectations. - Proposal does not show how curriculum delivers practice and application of the Michigan Content Expectations in real world, relevant job-related scenarios and/or project based application.	- There is a summary description of how demonstrated proficiency is achieved. - There is a description of the technology based curriculum used in the grant. - There is a statement that says the curriculum used aligns to the Michigan Content Expectation. - There is some mention of curriculum presenting the expectations in real world, relevant job-related scenarios and/or project based application.	- There is a complete description of how students will earn credit by demonstrated proficiency and there is a clear articulation of the change required to implement the new model. - There is a curriculum demo available and the url is noted if available for the technology based curriculum used in the delivery of instruction. - There is evidence showing how the curriculum used in the grant aligns to the Michigan Content Expectations. - The curriculum content being used clearly shows how content is relevant to real world, relevant job-related scenarios and/or project based application.

Score_____/20

EETT Models of Demonstrated Proficiency Grant Category VI

F. Technology Enabled Curriculum – 20 pts

- Technology enabled curriculum should allow for teacher/student interaction.

- Technology enabled curriculum should allow for peer to peer interaction.

- Technology enabled curriculum should allow teachers to modify or change content to meet district needs.

- Technology enabled curriculum is comprehensive to each grade level.

Rating Scale

Minimal 1-6 pts.	Adequate 7-12 pts.	Excellent 13 - 20 pts.
- There is little or no evidence that curriculum allows for teacher/student interaction. - There is little or no evidence that curriculum allows for peer to peer interaction. - There is little or no evidence that curriculum can be modified or changed to meet district needs. - Curriculum does not meet the needs of all core curriculum content expectations.	- Proposal describes how the curriculum supports teacher/student interaction. - Proposal describes how the curriculum supports peer to peer interaction. - Proposal uses curriculum that allows some modification. - Proposal includes technology enabled curriculum that meets one or two core content areas.	- There is a clear explanation as to how and why it is important for teachers and students to have the ability to interact online. - There is a clear explanation that speaks to the importance of students forming a web based learning community. - The proposal includes curriculum that is easily modified by teachers to allow for personalization and to meet the needs of the students/school/ district. - The curriculum chosen is comprehensive enough to meet all four core content areas (Math, Science, English Language Arts, Social Studies) and

		should include an evaluation for rigor and relevance across all four content areas.

Score_____/20

EETT Models of Demonstrated Proficiency Grant Category VI

G. Michigan Certified Teachers – 15 pts.

- Michigan certified teachers play a significant role in the proposal.

- Highly qualified Michigan teachers play a significant role in the proposal.

Rating Scale

Minimal 1-5 pts.	Adequate 6 – 10 pts.	Excellent 11-15 pts.
• There is little or no reference to Michigan certified teachers in the proposal. • There is little or no reference to highly qualified Michigan teachers in the proposal.	• Michigan certified teachers play some role in the proposal. • Highly qualified Michigan teachers play some role in the proposal.	• It is very evident in the proposal that Michigan certified teachers play a significant role. • It is very evident in the proposal that highly qualified Michigan teachers play a significant role.

Score_____/15

INFORMATION CONCERNING OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Length of Award:

Funding will be effective immediately following the Superintendent of Public Instruction approval of grant awards (anticipated in December 2008) with an ending date of June 30, 2010.

Payment Schedule:

Payments to the grantee will be made upon filing the Department's "Expenditures/Request Form, DS-4492A." The grantee is permitted to request advance payments not exceeding immediate cash needs and reimbursement up to the total amount of the award. "Immediate cash needs" means that the recipient needs funds within 30 days to pay bills incurred.

Financial Reporting:

A final expenditure report will be required within 60 days of the grant ending date, showing all bills paid in full.

Ownership of Materials Produced:

Ownership of products resulting from an EETT grant, which are subject to copyright of economic value, shall remain with the Michigan Department of Education unless such ownership is explicitly waived. This stipulation covers recipients as well as subcontractors receiving funds through this grant program.